

**Draft Summary of the Engineering and Operations Work Group Meeting  
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)  
September 27, 2002**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Engineering and Operations Work Group meeting on September 27, 2002 via videoconference and conference call.

A summary of the discussions, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present an informational summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following attachments are provided with this summary:

- Attachment 1 Meeting Agenda
- Attachment 2 Meeting Attendees
- Attachment 3 Operations Modeling Update
- Attachment 4 Draft Schedule for Plenary and Work Group Meetings

### **Introduction**

Attendees were welcomed to the Engineering and Operations Work Group meeting. The meeting agenda and desired outcomes were reviewed. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively.

### **August 23, 2002 Meeting Summary and Action Items**

A summary of the August 23, 2002 Engineering and Operations Work Group is posted on the relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

#### **Carry Over Action Items**

**Action Item #EO57:** Review summaries of Engineering and Operations models to be used during relicensing prepared by Modeling Task Force  
**Responsible:** Engineering and Operations Work Group participants  
**Status:** Curtis Creel Resource Area Manager for operations explained that the summaries are currently being updated to include more specificity and are expected to be available to the Engineering and Operations Work Group in October. He informed participants that he intends to convene a Modeling Protocol Task Force meeting to review the summaries before the October Engineering and Operations Work Group meeting if possible.

**Action Item EO#55** Provide summary of watershed modeling issues for Work Group, with input from Work Group participants  
**Responsible:** DWR  
**Status:** As requested by Butte County, this Action Item will be carried over until December 2002.

**Action Item EO#49** Discuss Fluvial 12 modeling with appropriate DWR and consulting team members to determine data needs.  
**Responsible:** Joint Engineering and Operations/Environmental Task Force  
**Status:** Curtis reported that Ken Kules, representing MWD and Koll Buer, Steve Ford, Tuan Bui and Curtis Creel representing DWR have met and discussed Ken's concerns off-line so the joint meeting discussion would be more focused. He said the meeting was very productive and many of Ken's concerns were addressed. He suggested scheduling a Joint Engineering and Operations/Environmental Task Force meeting

to revisit Fluvial 12 as planned and added that such a meeting would also be an excellent opportunity to conduct a tabletop demonstration of operations modeling, explore the interactions of models associated with Oroville Facilities relicensing and step through the modeling process using a series of 'what if' scenarios. He reminded the group that a similar exercise conducted a few months ago, although lightly attended, was very helpful to those that participated. The participants discussed a number of possible dates and eventually decided that since the Environmental Work Group canceled their October Work Group meeting, the Joint Task Force could take advantage of the date and location. The Joint Engineering and Operations/Environmental Task Force meeting was tentatively scheduled for October 23, 2002 from 9:30a.m. to 3:30 p.m. at the Kelly Ridge Golf Course meeting room in Oroville.

Eric Theiss with National Marine Fisheries Service asked if the Engineering and Operations Work Group was going to discuss coordination with Yuba/Feather Work Group. Curtis Creel responded that the topic was not on the agenda for today's meeting and participants who attended last month's Engineering and Operations Work Group meeting decided not to schedule further formal coordination meetings with the Yuba/Feather Work Group. Curtis further explained that DWR has established a routine working relationship with Yuba County regarding flood management issues.

Eric responded that he is concerned DWR and the Yuba/Feather Work Group are not coordinating enough regarding flood control and DWR's responsibilities under FERC's jurisdiction. Curtis responded that the question of FERC jurisdiction over flood control issues has been discussed at both the Work Group and Plenary Group levels and is being appropriately handled. He also reminded Eric that the Oroville Facilities Relicensing process is a collaborative process where members of the Yuba/Feather Work Group may participate as stakeholders and raise issues of concern for relicensing participants to consider. Ken Kules added that a presentation on flood management is on the agenda for the October Plenary Group meeting.

### **Update on Plenary Activities**

The Facilitator updated participants on the September 24, 2002 Plenary Group activities that included discussions on Study Plan F9, Hatchery Impacts and process issues including dispute resolution and determination of consensus as defined in the Process Protocols. Curtis attended the September Plenary Group meeting and provided an update on model development but the planned operations presentation was postponed to the October Plenary Group meeting due to time constraints.

### **Update on Joint Engineering and Operations/Environmental Task Force**

See discussion under "Status" for Action Item EO#49 above.

### **Operations Modeling Update**

Curtis provided participants with a document summarizing the status of operations modeling efforts (Attachment 3). He explained that this update includes new information on HYDROPS, a model developed by Powel Technologies that will be used to model local operations and WQRRS, a model in the public domain developed by the Corps of Engineers that will be used to model temperature. Ken Kules asked about the rationale for using temperature modeling related to agricultural deliveries as opposed to hard data currently collected at agricultural diversion points. Curtis explained that modeling in this case would only be used to analyze perturbations resulting from operational changes within the system since agreements currently in place do not identify a specific temperature for delivery but agrees to deliver water at a temperature farmers could have expected without the project.

Curtis reported that earlier problems with obtaining calibration information for RMA 10, the UC Davis model, were resolved and the modelers plan to develop it for use if needed before the complete temperature model is available. He added that if he is able to obtain the services of the original author of RMA 10, the model could be available for use within a couple of months. Ken Kules suggested that information obtained from RMA 10 could be used to help calibrate the more robust temperature model.

### **Next Steps**

Curtis discussed the need to review the 150 pages of assumptions necessary to run CALSIM II. He reminded participants that CALSIM II would be used to provide boundary conditions or targets for the more localized models. He explained that his staff is currently reviewing the assumptions and working to identify adjustments to accommodate relicensing requirements, while understanding that some of the assumptions included in the set necessary to run CALSIM II, such as San Joaquin Valley information, is likely of little concern to this group. Curtis proposed to provide the participants with a trimmed down list of assumptions relevant to relicensing in advance of the next Work Group meeting for review and discussion in October. He added that anyone interested in reviewing the complete set of assumptions currently used for CALSIM II could access the data at <http://modeling.water.ca.gov/hydro/studies/SWPReliability/index.html>.

The Facilitator distributed a new schedule indicating Plenary and Work Group meeting dates through July 2003 (Attachment 4).

### **Next Meeting**

The Engineering and Operations Work Group agreed their next meeting would be:

Date: October 25, 2002

Time: 9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Location: Oroville Field Division, videoconference with MWD and NMFS and a conference call-in number available.

### **Action Items**

The following list of action items identified by the Engineering and Operations Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action and due date.

**Action Item #EO59:** Distribute set of CALSIM II assumptions identified by DWR staff that may be adjusted for use in the Oroville Relicensing modeling effort.

**Responsible:** DWR/consulting team

**Due Date:** October 16, 2002

### **Carry Over Action Items**

**Action Item #EO57:** Review summaries of Engineering and Operations models to be used during relicensing prepared by Modeling Task Force

**Responsible:** Engineering and Operations Work Group participants

**Due Date:** Summaries expected to be available in October.

**Action Item EO#55** Provide summary of watershed modeling issues for Work Group, with input from Work Group participants

**Responsible:** DWR

**Due Date:** December 2002

**Action Item EO#49** Discuss Fluvial 12 modeling with appropriate DWR and consulting team members to determine data needs.  
**Responsible:** Joint Engineering and Operations/Environmental Task Force  
**Due Date:** October 23, 2002